

Moment densities of super-Brownian motion, and a Harnack estimate for a class of X -harmonic functions

Thomas S. Salisbury and A. Deniz Sezer ¹

York University and University of Calgary

Abstract: This paper features a comparison inequality for the densities of the moment measures of super-Brownian motion. These densities are defined recursively for each $n \geq 1$ in terms of the Poisson and Green's kernels, hence can be analyzed using the techniques of classical potential theory. When $n = 1$, the moment density is equal to the Poisson kernel, and the comparison is simply the classical inequality of Harnack. For $n > 1$ we find that the constant in the comparison inequality grows at most exponentially with n . We apply this to a class of X -harmonic functions H^ν of super-Brownian motion, introduced by Dynkin. We show that for a.e. H^ν in this class, $H^\nu(\mu) < \infty$ for every μ .

1. A moment density inequality

Let D be a bounded and smooth domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$ and let $\Delta = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2}$. Let $g_D(x, y)$ and $k_D(x, y)$ be respectively the Green's and Poisson kernels of D for the operator Δ . That is, for $x \in D$, $g_D(x, \cdot) : D - \{x\} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is the unique $C^2(D - \{x\}) \cap C^1(\bar{D} - \{x\})$ solution of

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta u &= 2\delta_x \text{ on } D \\ u &= 0 \text{ on } \partial D.\end{aligned}$$

Then for $z \in \partial D$, $k_D(x, y) \in [0, \infty)$ is the derivative of $g_D(x, z)$, considered as a function of z , in the direction of the inward conormal n_y to ∂D at the point $y \in \partial D$. For fixed $y \in \partial D$, the function $u = k_D(\cdot, y)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta u &= 0 \text{ on } D \\ u &= 0 \text{ on } \partial D - \{y\}.\end{aligned}$$

For $y \in D$, $\lim_{x \rightarrow y} g_D(x, y) = \infty$. Similarly, for fixed $y \in \partial D$, $\lim_{x \rightarrow y} k_D(x, y) = \infty$, provided the limit is taken non-tangentially. (See [Doob \(1984\)](#) for these and other basic results in potential theory.) The notation $D' \Subset D$ will mean that D' has compact closure which is contained in D .

Let $n \geq 1$, and let $z_1, \dots, z_n$ be distinct points on ∂D . We will define a function $\rho_D(x, z_1, \dots, z_n)$, $x \in D$ recursively, by defining a family of functions $\rho_D(x, z_A)$, where $A = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $z_A = (z_{i_1}, \dots, z_{i_k})$. Set

$$\rho_D(x, z_A) = k_D(x, z_i) \text{ if } A = \{i\}, \quad (1)$$

and for $|A| > 1$ set

$$\rho_D(x, z_A) = \sum_{B \subset A, B \neq \emptyset, A} \int_D g_D(x, y) \rho_D(y, z_B) \rho_D(y, z_{A-B}) dy. \quad (2)$$

We let $\rho_D(x, z_1, \dots, z_n) = \rho_D(x, z_A)$ for $A = \{1, \dots, n\}$. It is known that $\rho_D(x, z_1, \dots, z_n)$ is a finite valued function of $x \in D$. See, for example [Dynkin \(2004a\)](#) or [Salisbury and Verzani \(1999\)](#). In section 3 we will interpret ρ as a moment density. Unless needed for clarity we will drop the subscript D in ρ_D , k_D and g_D .

The main estimate of this section is the following theorem:

¹Both authors are supported in part by NSERC. This version June 29, 2012. MSC 60J68 (primary); 60J45, 31B05 (secondary)

Theorem 1. *Let D be a smooth and bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$. For any compact $C \subset D$, there exists a $\lambda > 0$ depending only on C and D such that*

$$\rho(x, z_1, \dots, z_n) \leq \lambda^n \rho(x_0, z_1, \dots, z_n)$$

for all x and $x_0 \in C$ and for all distinct $z_1, \dots, z_n \in \partial D^n$.

We will describe the implications of this result in section 2.

One should compare the above estimate to Harnack's inequality: Indeed, when $n = 1$, $\rho(x, z) = k(x, z)$. The theorem in this case therefore follows from Harnack's inequality, which asserts that there exists θ_C depending only on C and D s.t $k(x, z) \leq \theta_C k(x_0, z)$ for all $x, x_0 \in C$ and $z \in \partial D$.

The proof for general n will be given in Section 4. To see where the main challenge in the proof arises, consider the case $n = 2$. Then, $\rho(x, z_1, z_2) = 2 \int_D g(x, y) k(y, z_1) k(y, z_2) dy$. Due to Harnack's inequality, there exists a $\theta_{D'}$ such that $g(x, y) \leq \theta_{D'} g(x_0, y)$ for any $y \in D - D'$, where $C \subset D'$, and $D' \Subset D$. If this inequality were to hold on the entire set D it would be easy to compare $\rho(x, z_1, z_2)$ with $\rho(x_0, z_1, z_2)$. However this is not the case, as $g(x, y)$ blows up when y is near x . Since the integral defining ρ is taken over the entire domain D , in order to compare $\rho(x, \cdot)$ with $\rho(x_0, \cdot)$ we need finer estimates for $g(x, y)$ when y is near x , and for $k(y, z_1)k(y, z_2)$ when y is near z_1 or z_2 .

The proof follows an inductive argument. We will obtain compact subsets $C_0 \supset C_1 \supset \dots \supset C$ of D . Then for each n , we will prove that

$$\rho(x, z_1, \dots, z_n) \leq \lambda^n \rho(x_0, z_1, \dots, z_n)$$

for all $x, x_0 \in C_n$, assuming

$$\rho(x, z_1, \dots, z_{n-1}) \leq \lambda^{n-1} \rho(x_0, z_1, \dots, z_{n-1})$$

for all $x, x_0 \in C_{n-1}$. We do this by decomposing $\int_D g(x, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{B^c}) dy$ as

$$\int_{B(x, \delta_n)} g(x, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{B^c}) dy + \int_{D-B(x, \delta_n)} g(x, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{B^c}) dy$$

where $\delta_n = \frac{\delta}{Nn^2}$. Here δ is the diameter of the domain and N is a certain constant strictly greater than 1. For the first term, we use the induction hypothesis and the fact that $g(x, y)$ behaves like $|x - y|^{2-d}$ when y is near x to show that

$$\int_{B(x, \delta_n)} g(x, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{B^c}) dy \leq \frac{\lambda^n}{2} \int_{B(x_0, \delta_n)} g(x_0, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{B^c}) dy$$

for some $\lambda > 0$. For the second term we use the 3-G inequality. In the case $d \geq 3$ this gives a θ depending only on D such that

$$\frac{g(x, y)}{g(x_0, y)} \leq \theta \frac{|x - y|^{2-d} + |x - x_0|^{2-d}}{g(x, x_0)}.$$

The critical factor on the right side is $|x - y|^{2-d}$, which results in a bound for $\frac{g(x, y)}{g(x_0, y)}$ on $D - B(x, \delta_n)$ of the order of n^{2d} which can in turn be bounded by λ^n if λ is large enough. This implies that

$$\int_{D-B(x, \delta_n)} g(x, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{B^c}) dy \leq \frac{\lambda^n}{2} \int_{D-B(x, \delta_n)} g(x, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{B^c}) dy.$$

Putting these two pieces together will prove the theorem.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we will describe an application of Theorem 1 to a finiteness question for an interesting class of extended X -harmonic functions related to super-Brownian motion (originally introduced by Dynkin). Section 3 contains the proof of this result, and the proof of Theorem 1 is given in Section 4.

2. X -harmonic functions

The functions $\rho_D(x, z_1, \dots, z_n)$ will arise as moment densities of super-Brownian motion. More precisely, we consider a super-Brownian motion on some domain E (larger than all domains D of interest), as represented by Dynkin in terms of exit measures. See e.g. [Dynkin \(2002\)](#) for the definition and construction. This is a branching-exit-Markov system (X_D, P_μ) indexed by sub-domains D of E , and by finite measures μ supported in E . Under the probability law P_μ , each X_D is a random finite measure, referred to as the *exit measure* from D of super-Brownian motion started with measure μ . Heuristically, in a branching particle approximation to super-Brownian motion, it would be approximated by a multiple of the empirical measure of the particles frozen when they exit D . More formally, it has the following basic properties:

- (a) Exit property: $P_\mu(X_D(D) = 0) = 1$ for every μ , and if $\mu(D) = 0$ then $P_\mu(X_D = \mu) = 1$.
- (b) Markov property: If $Y \geq 0$ is measurable with respect to the σ -algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\subset D}$ generated by $X_{D'}, D' \subset D$ and $Z \geq 0$ is measurable with respect to the σ -algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\supset D}$ generated by $X_{D''}, D'' \supset D$ then

$$P_\mu(YZ) = P_\mu(Y P_{X_D} Z).$$

- (c) Branching property: For any non-negative Borel f , $P_\mu(e^{-\langle X_D, f \rangle}) = e^{-\langle \mu, V_D f \rangle}$ where

$$V_D f(y) = -\log P_y(e^{-\langle X_D, f \rangle})$$

and $P_y = P_{\delta_y}$.

- (d) Integral equation for the log-Laplace functional: $V_D f$ solves the integral equation

$$u + G_D(2u^2) = K_D f$$

where G_D and K_D are respectively Green and Poisson operators for Brownian motion in D .

The operators referred to above are defined as follows: If ξ_t is a Brownian motion starting from x , under a probability measure Π_x , then $K_D f(x) = \Pi_x f(\xi_{\tau_D})$, where τ_D is the exit time from D . Likewise, $G_D f(x) = \Pi_x(\int_0^{\tau_D} f(\xi_t) dt)$. In terms of the kernels g_D and k_D defined earlier, $G_D f(x) = \int_D g_D(x, y) dy$ and $K_D f(x) = \int f(y) k_D(x, y) \sigma(dy)$, where σ is the surface measure on ∂D .

Under certain regularity conditions on D and f (see e.g. [Dynkin \(2002\)](#)), the integral equation in (d) is equivalent to the boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \Delta u &= 2u^2 \text{ on } D \\ u &= f \text{ on } \partial D. \end{aligned}$$

A recent research program, initiated by Dynkin, aims to build a Martin boundary theory for the above semi-linear pde employing ideas from the probabilistic construction of Martin boundary for the Laplace equation $\frac{1}{2} \Delta u = 0$. In this new context, the analogue of harmonic functions are X -harmonic functions, defined as follows. Let $\mathcal{M}_D^c$ denote the space of finite measures supported on a compact subset of D . Consider a function $H : \mathcal{M}_D^c \rightarrow [0, \infty]$. H is called *extended X -harmonic* in D if

$$P_\mu(H(X_{D'})) = H(\mu)$$

for all $D' \Subset D$ and μ s.t. μ is supported in D' . If, in addition $H(\mu)$ is finite for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_D^c$, then H is called *X -harmonic* (this definition is due to Dynkin – see [Dynkin \(2004a\)](#)).

Define

$$P_{\mu, X_D}(A) := P_\mu(X_D \in A, X_D \neq 0).$$

Theorem 5.3.2 of [Dynkin \(2004b\)](#) shows that P_{μ_1, X_D} and P_{μ_2, X_D} are mutually absolutely continuous. We fix $x_0 \in D$, and take $R = P_{\delta_{x_0}, X_D}$ as a reference measure. Following [Dynkin \(2006b\)](#), we define

$$H^\nu(\mu) = H_D^\nu(\mu) = \frac{dP_{\mu, X_D}}{dR}(\nu). \quad (3)$$

Unless there is ambiguity about the domain D in question, we will suppress the subscript D in H_D^ν .

Of course, for each μ this is only uniquely defined for R -a.e. ν , so to proceed further we will need to specify more regular versions. The following is contained in Theorem 2 of [Salisbury and Sezer \(2012\)](#) (whose proof is a modification of that of Theorem 1.1 of [Dynkin \(2006b\)](#)), and establishes the existence of a jointly measurable version of $H^\nu(\mu)$ that is extended X -harmonic for R -almost all ν . We assume that D is a bounded domain all of whose boundary points are regular. The smoothness assumption of Theorem 1 is not required here.

Theorem 2. ([Dynkin \(2006b\)](#), [Salisbury and Sezer \(2012\)](#)) *Let D be a bounded and regular domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$. There exists a measurable function $(\mu, \nu) \mapsto H^\nu(\mu) \in [0, \infty]$, defined for finite $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_D^c$ and finite ν supported on ∂D , and an R -null set V_0 such that:*

- (a) *For each $\nu \notin V_0$, $\mu \mapsto H^\nu(\mu)$ is extended X -harmonic.*
- (b) *For each μ , $\nu \mapsto H^\nu(\mu)$ is a version of the density in (3).*

For each fixed μ , (b) implies that $H^\nu(\mu) < \infty$ for R -a.e. ν . But the R -null set where $H^\nu(\mu) = \infty$ could in principle depend on μ , so one does not automatically obtain any ν for which $H^\nu(\mu) < \infty \forall \mu$. In other words, it is not clear that any of the H^ν is X -harmonic. However, we can establish this using Theorem 1:

Theorem 3. *Let D be a bounded and regular domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$. There exists an $H^\nu(\mu)$ as in Theorem 2, and an R -null set V_1 such that for $\nu \notin V_1$, H^ν is X -harmonic, and $0 < H^\nu(\mu) < \infty$ for every μ .*

The above is the principle result of this section, and the main application of Theorem 1. We give the proof in section 3, and will spend the remainder of the current section setting the context for this result, and giving relations to other work.

Note first that the statement of Theorem 1.1 of [Dynkin \(2006b\)](#) is stronger (ie. X -harmonic) than what is verified in the proof there (ie. what we call extended X -harmonic). Obtaining the required finiteness estimate was the motivation for the current paper.

If H is a non-zero X -harmonic function one can proceed to define an H -transform of the law P_μ . Set $P_\mu^H(Y) = \frac{1}{H(\mu)} P_\mu(YH(X_{D'}))$ for any non-negative Y measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}_{D'} = \sigma(X_{\tilde{D}}, \tilde{D} \subset D')$ where $D' \Subset D$ contains the support of μ . Because H is X -harmonic, the Markov property implies that these probability laws will be consistent as we vary D' , so can be uniquely extended to $\mathcal{F}_{D-} = \sigma(X_{D'}, D' \Subset D)$, as in Section 1.3 of [Dynkin \(2006b\)](#). See also Theorem 2(d) of [Salisbury and Sezer \(2012\)](#). Note that the mutual absolute continuity of P_{μ_1, X_D} and P_{μ_2, X_D} , for μ_1 and μ_2 compactly supported in D , implies that if $H(\mu)$ is non-zero from one μ then it is non-zero for all μ . Thus the only obstacle to defining P_μ^H for H extended X -harmonic is the possibility that $H(\mu) = \infty$.

Fix $a \in D$, $a \neq x_0$ and let $\mathcal{H}^a$ be the convex set of all X -harmonic functions s.t. $P_{\delta_a}(H(X_{D'})) = 1$ for some D' with $a \in D' \Subset D$. The (minimal) Martin boundary is then defined as the set of extreme elements of $\mathcal{H}^a$. In [Dynkin \(2004a\)](#) it is shown that this set is independent of the reference point a . One motivation for introducing the Radon-Nikodym densities $H^\nu(\mu)$ of [Dynkin \(2006b\)](#) was to try to recover the extreme X -harmonic functions by a deterministic limiting procedure from these densities, using the classical exit theory for Markov chains. What is actually known is a weak version of such a result. Specifically, Dynkin succeeded in showing that if H is an extreme X -harmonic function in D and $D_n \Subset D$ is a sequence of domains exhausting D , then $H(\mu) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_{D_n}^{X_{D_n}}(\mu)$, P_μ^H almost surely. A stronger version is conjectured, namely that there exists a deterministic sequence ν_n (not depending on μ) and canonical versions of the $H_{D_n}^{\nu_n}$ (eg. having some type of regularity in ν_n), such that $H(\mu) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_{D_n}^{\nu_n}(\mu)$ for every μ . Dynkin has pointed out that significant progress could be made if one knew that the densities $H_{D_n}^{X_{D_n}}$ were uniformly integrable. A subsequent paper [Dynkin \(2006a\)](#) focused on the densities $H_D^\nu(\mu)$ and the search for more analytically tractable representations.

The densities H_D^ν played a key role in [Salisbury and Sezer \(2012\)](#) as well, in particular, in the analysis of super-Brownian motion $(X_{D'})_{D' \Subset D}$ conditioned on its exit measure X_D . In addition to Theorem 2, that paper showed that $P_\mu^{H_D^\nu}$ is the conditional law of SBM given $X_D = \nu$, for R -a.e. ν satisfying $H_D^\nu(\mu) < \infty$. Assuming that D is a regular domain, they express H_D^ν as an infinite sum of integrated polynomial-like functions of μ involving a family of fragmentation kernels $K_n(\nu, d\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$ and a family of potentials $\gamma_\nu(\cdot)$, (see formula (6) below). This representation is then used to derive an infinite fragmentation system description for $P_\mu^{H_D^\nu}$.

In the current paper we will use the representation of [Salisbury and Sezer \(2012\)](#) to tie the densities H_D^ν to the functions $\rho(x, z, \dots, z_n)$ and prove Theorem 3. This suggests that the comparison inequality of Theorem 1 may prove useful in investigating other regularity properties of H_D^ν . In a subsequent paper, one of us (Sezer) will study the extremality properties of this family for smooth domains. As a future direction of research, we hope to use the comparison inequality to investigate uniform integrability properties of the sequences $H_{D_n}^{\nu_n}$ of [Dynkin \(2006b\)](#).

We conjecture that a much stronger version of Theorem 3 is true. Namely that if H is any extended X -harmonic function, and $H(\mu) < \infty$ for some μ , then $H(\mu) < \infty$ for all μ .

3. Proof of Theorem 3

It is well known that X_D has an infinitely divisible distribution for each D . This property is tied to a construction of the probabilities P_μ in terms of another (now σ -finite) measure $\mathbb{N}_x$, called the *super-Brownian excursion law*. Once again, there are finite exit measures X_D under $\mathbb{N}_x$, for every D . Form a Poisson random measure

$$\Pi(d\chi) = \sum_i \delta_{\chi^i}$$

with intensity $\mathcal{R}_\mu(A) = \int \mathbb{N}_x(X_D \in A, X_D \neq 0) \mu(dx)$. Then under P_μ , X_D has the law of $\sum \chi^i = \int \chi \Pi(d\chi)$.

The n -dimensional moment measures of SBM are the following measures defined on $(\partial D)^n$: Let $f(z_1, \dots, z_n) = f_1(z_1) \dots f_n(z_n)$ where f_i are positive Borel functions on ∂D , and define

$$N_{x,n,D}(f) = \mathbb{N}_x(\langle X_D, f_1 \rangle \cdots \langle X_D, f_n \rangle) \quad (4)$$

$$p_{\mu,n,D}(f) = P_\mu(\langle X_D, f_1 \rangle \cdots \langle X_D, f_n \rangle). \quad (5)$$

Theorem 4 (Theorem 5.3.1 of [Dynkin \(2004b\)](#)). *Let $x \in D$, and let μ be compactly supported in D . If D is smooth then both $N_{x,n,D}$ and $p_{\mu,n,D}$ have densities with respect to $\sigma(dz_1) \times \sigma(dz_2) \times \cdots \times \sigma(dz_n)$ where $\sigma(dz)$ denotes the surface measure on ∂D . Moreover,*

$$\begin{aligned} N_{x,n,D}(dz_1, \dots, dz_n) &= \rho(x, z_1, \dots, z_n) \sigma(dz_1) \sigma(dz_2) \cdots \sigma(dz_n) \\ p_{\mu,n,D}(dz_1, \dots, dz_n) &= \sum_{\pi(n)} \langle \mu, \rho(\cdot, z_{C_1}) \rangle \cdots \langle \mu, \rho(\cdot, z_{C_r}) \rangle \sigma(dz_1) \sigma(dz_2) \cdots \sigma(dz_n) \end{aligned}$$

where $\pi(n)$ denotes the set of partitions $\{C_1, \dots, C_r\}$ of $\{1, \dots, n\}$.

The proof of Theorem 3 involves only $p_{\mu,n,D}$, not $N_{x,n,D}$. But the latter gives the natural context for directly interpreting ρ .

Let V^* be the space of nonzero and finite measures on ∂D . Let $u(x) = \mathbb{N}_x(X_D \neq 0)$. For a regular domain, [Salisbury and Sezer \(2012\)](#) construct a family of functions $\{\gamma_\nu : D \rightarrow (0, \infty), \nu \in V^*\}$ such that the mapping $(\nu, y) \mapsto \gamma_\nu(y)$ is measurable, each γ_ν is superharmonic, and for all $y \in D$

$$N_{y,X_D}(d\nu) := \mathbb{N}_y(X_D \in d\nu, X_D \neq 0) = \gamma_\nu(y) R(d\nu).$$

In addition, [Salisbury and Sezer \(2012\)](#) construct a measurable strictly positive kernel $K_n(\nu; d\nu_1, d\nu_2, \dots, d\nu_n)$ from V^* to $(V^*)^n$, concentrated on $\{(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n) : \nu_1 + \cdots + \nu_n = \nu\}$, and an R -null set V_0 , such that

$$H^\nu(\mu) = \begin{cases} e^{-\langle \mu, u \rangle + u(x_0)}, & \text{if } \nu = 0 \\ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{1}{n!} e^{-\langle \mu, u \rangle} K_n(\nu; d\nu_1, \dots, d\nu_n) \langle \mu, \gamma_{\nu_1} \rangle \langle \mu, \gamma_{\nu_2} \rangle \cdots \langle \mu, \gamma_{\nu_n} \rangle, & \text{if } \nu \neq 0 \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

is extended X -harmonic for each $\nu \notin V_0$, is a version of the density in (3) for each μ , and also satisfies

$$\gamma_\nu(y) = \mathbb{N}_y(H^\nu(X_{D'}))$$

for every y , every $D' \Subset D$ such that $y \in D'$, and every $\nu \notin V_0$.

Proof of Theorem 3. Fix $a > 0$. It suffices to show the statement of the theorem for μ satisfying $\langle \mu, 1 \rangle \leq a$. We may assume $\nu \neq 0$.

Because D is regular there exists a sequence of smooth domains $D_1 \Subset D_2 \Subset \dots \Subset D$ exhausting D . Let x_0 be the reference point fixed earlier, and let μ_0 be the point mass at x_0 . Let μ be another finite measure compactly supported in D . Then there exists a smooth domain $\tilde{D} \in \{D_1, D_2, \dots\}$ containing the point x_0 and the support of μ . Choose $H^\nu(\mu)$, V_0 , γ_ν and K_n as above.

Let $\rho_{\tilde{D}}(x, z_1, \dots, z_n)$, and $\rho_{\tilde{D}}(x, z_C)$, $C \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$, $n \geq 1$ be the family of functions defined by equations (1) and (2). Let $p_{\mu, n, \tilde{D}}$ be the measure on $\partial \tilde{D}$ defined as in (5). Note that by Theorem 4,

$$\frac{dp_{\mu, n, \tilde{D}}}{dp_{\mu_0, n, \tilde{D}}}(z_1, \dots, z_n) = \frac{\sum_{\pi(n)} \langle \mu, \rho(\cdot, z_{C_1}) \rangle \cdots \langle \mu, \rho(\cdot, z_{C_r}) \rangle}{\sum_{\pi(n)} \rho(x_0, z_{C_1}) \cdots \rho(x_0, z_{C_r})}. \quad (7)$$

By Theorem 1 there exists $\lambda > 0$ depending only on $\tilde{D}$ and $C \cup \{x_0\}$ such that

$$\rho(x, z_{C_i}) \leq \lambda^{|C_i|} \rho(x_0, z_{C_i}) \text{ for every } x \in C. \quad (8)$$

Equation (7) and the inequality (8) imply that

$$\frac{dp_{\mu, n, \tilde{D}}}{dp_{\mu_0, n, \tilde{D}}} \leq (a\lambda)^n. \quad (9)$$

Let $\tilde{H}_x^\nu(\mu) = e^{\langle \mu, u \rangle} H_x^\nu(\mu)$. Using the formula (6), the Fubini theorem, and (9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P_\mu(\tilde{H}_x^\nu(X_{\tilde{D}})) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{1}{n!} K_n(\nu; d\nu_1, \dots, d\nu_n) P_\mu(\langle X_{\tilde{D}}, \gamma_{\nu_1} \rangle \cdots \langle X_{\tilde{D}}, \gamma_{\nu_n} \rangle) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{1}{n!} K_n(\nu; d\nu_1, \dots, d\nu_n) p_{\mu, n, \tilde{D}}(\gamma_{\nu_1} \cdots \gamma_{\nu_n}) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{1}{n!} K_n(\nu; d\nu_1, \dots, d\nu_n) p_{\mu_0, n, \tilde{D}} \left(\frac{dp_{\mu, n, \tilde{D}}}{dp_{\mu_0, n, \tilde{D}}} \gamma_{\nu_1} \cdots \gamma_{\nu_n} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{1}{n!} K_n(\nu; d\nu_1, \dots, d\nu_n) p_{\mu_0, n, \tilde{D}}((a\lambda)^n \gamma_{\nu_1} \cdots \gamma_{\nu_n}) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{1}{n!} K_n(\nu; d\nu_1, \dots, d\nu_n) P_{\mu_0}(\langle a\lambda X_{\tilde{D}}, \gamma_{\nu_1} \rangle \cdots \langle a\lambda X_{\tilde{D}}, \gamma_{\nu_n} \rangle) \\ &= P_{\mu_0}(\tilde{H}^\nu(a\lambda X_{\tilde{D}})). \end{aligned}$$

We will now show that there exists a $V_1 \subset V^*$ such that $V_0 \subset V_1$, $R(V_1) = 0$, and for all $\nu \notin V_1$, $P_{\mu_0}(\tilde{H}^\nu(kX_{D_i})) < \infty$ for all integers $k \geq 1$ and $i \geq 1$. This will establish the theorem, since for all $\nu \notin V_1$,

$$H^\nu(\mu) = P_\mu(H^\nu(X_{\tilde{D}})) \leq P_\mu(\tilde{H}^\nu(X_{\tilde{D}})) \leq P_{\mu_0}(\tilde{H}^\nu(a\lambda X_{\tilde{D}})) \leq P_{\mu_0}(\tilde{H}^\nu(kX_{\tilde{D}})) < \infty$$

whenever $k \geq a\lambda$. Note that $H^\nu(\mu) > 0$ by definition, since the $\gamma_{\nu_i} > 0$.

Fix i and k . Let $M > 0$. For fixed μ , $H^\nu(\mu)$, $\nu \neq 0$ is a version of $\frac{dP_{\mu, X_D}}{dR}(\nu)$, so

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{V^*} e^{-\langle \nu, M \rangle} P_{\mu_0}(\tilde{H}^\nu(kX_{D_i})) R(d\nu) &= P_{\mu_0} \left(\int_{V^*} e^{-\langle \nu, M \rangle} \tilde{H}^\nu(kX_{D_i}) R(d\nu) \right) \\ &= P_{\mu_0}(e^{\langle kX_{D_i}, u \rangle} \int_{V^*} e^{-\langle \nu, M \rangle} dP_{kX_{D_i}, X_D}(d\nu)) \\ &= P_{\mu_0}(e^{\langle kX_{D_i}, u \rangle} P_{kX_{D_i}}(e^{-\langle X_D, M \rangle} 1_{X_D \neq 0})) \\ &\leq P_{\mu_0}(e^{\langle kX_{D_i}, u \rangle} P_{kX_{D_i}}(e^{-\langle X_D, M \rangle})) \\ &= P_{\mu_0}(e^{\langle kX_{D_i}, u \rangle} e^{-\langle kX_{D_i}, uM \rangle}), \end{aligned}$$

where u_M is the function on D defined by $u_M(x) = \log P_x(e^{-(X_D, M)})$.

The above derivation shows that $\int_{V^*} e^{-\langle \nu, M \rangle} P_{\mu_0}(\tilde{H}^\nu(kX_{D_i})) R(d\nu) \leq P_{\mu_0}(e^{\langle X_{D_i}, \lambda(u-u_M) \rangle})$. This is in fact finite if M is sufficiently large. To see this we use two facts: First, that u_M converges to u uniformly on the closure of $\tilde{D}$, as they are both continuous functions and $u_M \uparrow u$ pointwise in D as $M \rightarrow \infty$. Second, it is proven in [Salisbury and Verzani \(1999\)](#) that there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that $P_{x_0}(e^{\langle X_{D_i}, \epsilon \rangle}) < \infty$. Hence choosing M large enough that $\sup_{\tilde{D}} u - u_M < \frac{\epsilon}{k}$ will ensure that $\int_{V^*} e^{-\langle \nu, M \rangle} P_{\mu_0}(\tilde{H}^\nu(kX_{D_i})) R(d\nu)$ is finite.

Because $e^{-\langle \nu, M \rangle}$ is always nonzero, it follows that $P_{\mu_0}(\tilde{H}^\nu(kX_{D_i})) < \infty$, for R -a.e. ν . Now let V_1 be the subset of V^* defined as

$$V_1 = V_0 \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \{\nu \in V^* : P_{\mu_0}(\tilde{H}^\nu(kX_{D_i})) = \infty\}.$$

Then $R(V_1) = 0$, as required. $\square$

4. Proof of Theorem 1

We give the proof first for $d \geq 3$, and then describe how to modify it for $d = 2$. Let $\delta = \text{dist}(C, \partial D)$. We can find a sequence of smoothly bounded domains D_n with compact closures C_n such that $D \supset C_0 \supset C_1 \supset C_2 \supset \dots \supset C$ and

$$\text{dist}(C_{n+1}, C_n^c) > \frac{\delta}{(n+1)^2}, \text{ for all } n \geq 1. \quad (10)$$

From Harnack's inequality there exists a constant $\phi > 0$ depending only on C_0 and D such that

$$k(x, z) \leq \phi k(x_0, z) \text{ for all } x, x_0 \in C_0, \text{ and } z \in \partial D. \quad (11)$$

The 3-G inequality of [Cranston, Fabes and Zhao \(1988\)](#) gives a constant $\theta > 0$ depending only on D such that

$$\frac{g(x, y)}{g(x_0, y)} \leq \theta \frac{|x - y|^{2-d} + |x - x_0|^{2-d}}{g(x, x_0)} \text{ for all } x, x_0, y \in D. \quad (12)$$

Set $\beta = \text{dist}(C_0, \partial D) \wedge 1$. Recall that there is a constant c_d such that $g(x, y) = c_d|x - y|^{2-d} - h_x(y)$ where h_x is harmonic on D with boundary value $c_d|x - \cdot|^{2-d}$. Therefore

$$g(x, y) \leq c_d|x - y|^{2-d} \text{ for } x, y \in D, \text{ and} \quad (13)$$

$$g(x, y) \geq c_d|x - y|^{2-d} - c_d\beta^{2-d} \text{ if } x, y \in D, B(x, \beta) \subset D, \quad (14)$$

since $0 \leq h_x \leq c_d\beta^{2-d}$. This will imply the existence of finite constants K and B , depending only on D and C_0 , such that

$$\frac{1}{g(x, x_0)} \leq B \text{ and} \quad (15)$$

$$\frac{c_d|x - x_0|^{2-d}}{g(x, x_0)} \leq K, \text{ for all } x, x_0 \in C_0, x \neq x_0. \quad (16)$$

To see this, note that $g(x, x_0)$ is jointly continuous off the diagonal, and everywhere > 0 . Thus there is a strictly positive lower bound for g on $C_0 \times C_0$ less any neighbourhood of the diagonal. (14) gives such a bound on a neighbourhood of the diagonal in $C_0 \times C_0$. Thus (15) holds.

To see (16), if $x, x_0 \in C_0$ and $|x - x_0| \geq \frac{\beta}{2}$ then

$$g(x, x_0) \geq \frac{1}{B} \geq \frac{1}{Bc_d} \left(\frac{\beta}{2}\right)^{d-2} \cdot c_d|x - x_0|^{2-d}.$$

While if $x, x_0 \in C_0$ and $|x - x_0| \leq \frac{\beta}{2}$ then

$$g(x, x_0)[1 + Bc_d\beta^{2-d}] \geq g(x, x_0) + c_d\beta^{2-d} \geq c_d|x - x_0|^{2-d}$$

by (14). Therefore (16) holds with $K = \max(Bc_d(\beta/2)^{2-d}, 1 + Bc_d\beta^{2-d})$.

Take $N > 1$ to be a number whose value will be determined later. Let $A = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, where $n = |A| \geq 2$. Let x and x_0 be two distinct points in C_n . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_D g(x, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy &= \int_{B(x, \frac{\delta}{Nn^2})} g(x, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy \\ &\quad + \int_{D-B(x, \frac{\delta}{Nn^2})} g(x, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

We will obtain an estimate for each term in the above decomposition.

We start with the second term. By the 3-G inequality (12), we have the bound

$$g(x, y) \leq g(x_0, y) \frac{\theta}{g(x_0, x)} \left(|x - x_0|^{2-d} + \left(\frac{Nn^2}{\delta} \right)^{d-2} \right) \text{ for } y \in D - B(x, \frac{\delta}{Nn^2}).$$

Combining this with the estimates (15) and (16), we get

$$g(x, y) \leq g(x_0, y) \theta \left(\frac{K}{c_d} + \frac{BN^{d-2}n^{2(d-2)}}{\delta^{d-2}} \right) \text{ for } y \in D - B(x, \frac{\delta}{Nn^2}).$$

Writing $\tilde{K} = \theta \frac{K}{c_d}$ and $\tilde{B} = \theta \frac{BN^{d-2}}{\delta^{d-2}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{D-B(x, \frac{\delta}{Nn^2})} g(x, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy &\leq \left(\tilde{K} + \tilde{B}n^{2(d-2)} \right) \int_{D-B(x, \frac{\delta}{Nn^2})} g(x_0, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy \\ &\leq \left(\tilde{K} + \tilde{B}n^{2(d-2)} \right) \int_D g(x_0, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

To treat the first term in the decomposition (17), we introduce a new variable $y' = x_0 + M(y - x)$, $y \in B(x, \frac{\delta}{Nn^2})$, for some $M \geq 1$ whose value will be determined later. Since $y = x + \frac{1}{M}(y' - x_0)$, we have that $dy = M^{-d}dy'$, and $y \in B(x, \frac{\delta}{Nn^2})$ if and only if $y' \in B(x_0, \frac{M\delta}{Nn^2})$. So by (13)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B(x, \frac{\delta}{Nn^2})} g(x, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy &\leq c_d \int_{B(x, \frac{\delta}{Nn^2})} |x - y|^{2-d} \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy \\ &= c_d \int_{B(x_0, \frac{M\delta}{Nn^2})} \frac{1}{M^{2-d}} |x_0 - y'|^{2-d} \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) M^{-d} dy' \\ &= c_d \int_{B(x_0, \frac{M\delta}{Nn^2})} \frac{1}{M^2} |x_0 - y'|^{2-d} \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy'. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Take $N = 2M$. Note that $N > 1$, so this is consistent with the specification we gave earlier for N . Since $x_0 \in C_n$, we have $B(x_0, \frac{M\delta}{Nn^2}) = B(x_0, \frac{\delta}{2n^2}) \subset C_{n-1} \subset C_0$ by (10). Therefore we may apply (16) and (19) to get

$$\int_{B(x, \frac{\delta}{Nn^2})} g(x, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy \leq \frac{K}{M^2} \int_{B(x_0, \frac{\delta}{2n^2})} g(x_0, y') \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy'. \quad (20)$$

Choose $M \geq \sqrt{2K} \vee 1$ and combine the inequalities (20) and (18), to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_D g(x, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy &\leq \left(\tilde{K} + \tilde{B}n^{2(d-2)} \right) \int_D g(x_0, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{B(x_0, \frac{\delta}{2n^2})} g(x_0, y') \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy'. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Recall in the above inequality that x and x_0 are arbitrarily selected points in C_n , $n \geq 2$, and the constants $\tilde{K}$, $\tilde{B}$ are independent of x , x_0 and n .

To complete the proof we will proceed with an induction argument. Let λ be large enough that $\lambda \geq \phi$ (the constant in (11)) and $\frac{\lambda^n}{2} \geq \tilde{K} + \tilde{B}n^{2(d-2)}$ for all $n \geq 1$. Then we have that

$$\rho(x, z) \leq \phi \rho(x_0, z) \leq \lambda \rho(x_0, z) \text{ for all } x, x_0 \in C_1, z \in \partial D.$$

Let $n \geq 2$, and assume inductively that the following holds for all $k \leq n-1$, $x, x_0 \in C_k$, $z_1, \dots, z_k \in \partial D$:

$$\rho(x, z_1, \dots, z_k) \leq \lambda^k \rho(x_0, z_1, \dots, z_k).$$

Put $A = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Using the inequality (21) for all x, x_0 in C_n we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_D g(x, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy &\leq \frac{\lambda^n}{2} \int_D g(x_0, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{B(x_0, \frac{\delta}{2n^2})} g(x_0, y') \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy'. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Note that if $y' \in B(x_0, \frac{\delta}{2n^2})$ then $y = x + \frac{1}{M}(y' - x_0)$ is in $B(x, \frac{\delta}{2Mn^2})$. Since $M \geq 1$, $B(x, \frac{\delta}{2Mn^2}) \subset C_{n-1}$ by (10). Note also that $B(x_0, \frac{\delta}{2n^2}) \subset C_{n-1}$. By the inductive hypothesis, if $y \in B(x, \frac{\delta}{2Mn^2})$, and $y' \in B(x_0, \frac{\delta}{2n^2})$ then

$$\rho(y, z_B) \leq \lambda^{|B|} \rho(y', z_B) \text{ and } \rho(y, z_B) \leq \lambda^{|A-B|} \rho(y', z_{A-B})$$

for all proper subsets B of A . Substituting this in (22) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_D g(x, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dz &\leq \frac{\lambda^n}{2} \int_D g(x_0, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{B(x_0, \frac{\delta}{2n^2})} g(x_0, y') \lambda^{|B|} \lambda^{|A-B|} \rho(y', z_B) \rho(y', z_{A-B}) dy' \\ &\leq \lambda^n \int_D g(x_0, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(x, z_1, \dots, z_n) &= \sum_{B \subset A, B \neq \emptyset, A} \int_D g(x, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy \\ &\leq \lambda^n \sum_{B \subset A, B \neq \emptyset, A} \int_D g(x_0, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy \\ &= \lambda^n \rho(x_0, z_1, \dots, z_n). \end{aligned}$$

This establishes the result, when $d \geq 3$.

Essentially the same argument works when $d = 2$. The 3G inequality in that case is classical; We will use the version stated in Theorem 1.1 of McConnell (1990), namely that there exists θ for which

$$\frac{g(x, y)}{g(x_0, y)} \leq \theta \frac{g(x, y) + g(x, x_0) + 1}{g(x, x_0)} \text{ for all } x, x_0, y \in D. \quad (23)$$

Instead of (13) and (14) we have constants $\tilde{c}$ and c_2 such that

$$\begin{aligned} g(x, y) &\leq c_2 \log(1/|x - y|) + \tilde{c} \text{ for } x, y \in D, \text{ and} \\ g(x, y) &\geq c_2 \log(1/|x - y|) - c_2 \log(1/\beta) \text{ if } x, y \in D, B(x, \beta) \subset D. \end{aligned}$$

As before, this gives (15) and

$$\frac{c_2 \log(1/|x - x_0|)}{g(x, x_0)} \leq K$$

for all $x, x_0 \in C_0$, $x \neq x_0$, with $K = \max(Bc_2 \log(2/\beta), 1 + Bc_2 \log(1/\beta))$.

Let $N > 1$ and let $x, x_n \in C_n$ be distinct. By (23), we have for $y \in D - B(x, \frac{\delta}{Nn^2})$ that

$$\begin{aligned} g(x, y) &\leq g(x_0, y) \theta \left(\frac{g(x, y) + 1}{g(x, x_0)} + 1 \right) \\ &\leq g(x_0, y) \theta \left(B(1 + \tilde{c} + c_2 \log(1/|x - y|)) + 1 \right) \\ &\leq g(x_0, y) \theta \left(B(1 + \tilde{c} + c_2 \log(Nn^2/\delta)) + 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

So for $\tilde{K} = \theta \left(B(1 + \tilde{c} + c_2 \log(N/\delta)) + 1 \right)$ and $\tilde{B} = 2\theta Bc_2$ we get

$$\int_{D - B(x, \frac{\delta}{Nn^2})} g(x, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy \leq (\tilde{K} + \tilde{B} \log n) \int_D g(x_0, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy$$

in place of (18).

Take $N = 2M$ and set $y' = x_0 + M(y - x)$ as before. In place of (19) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B(x, \frac{\delta}{Nn^2})} g(x, y) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy &\leq \int_{B(x, \frac{\delta}{Nn^2})} \left(c_2 \log(1/|x - y|) + \tilde{c} \right) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy \\ &= \int_{B(x_0, \frac{M\delta}{Nn^2})} \frac{1}{M^2} \left(c_2 \log(M/|x_0 - y'|) + \tilde{c} \right) \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy' \\ &\leq \int_{B(x_0, \frac{\delta}{2n^2})} \frac{K + B(\tilde{c} + c_2 \log M)}{M^2} g(x_0, y') \rho(y, z_B) \rho(y, z_{A-B}) dy'. \end{aligned}$$

Now choose M so large that $\frac{K+B(\tilde{c}+c_2 \log M)}{M^2} \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and λ so that $\frac{\lambda^n}{2} \geq \tilde{K} + \tilde{B} \log n$ for $n \geq 1$, and the proof proceeds as before. $\square$

References

- CRANSTON, M., FABES, E. and ZHAO, Z. (1988). Conditional Gauge and Potential Theory for the Schrodinger Operator. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **307**, Number 1 171-194.
- DOOB, J. L. (1984). *Classical Potential Theory and its Probabilistic Counterpart*. Springer, New York.
- DYNKIN, E. B. (2002). *Diffusions, superdiffusions and partial differential equations*. Colloquium Publications **50**. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence.
- DYNKIN, E. B. (2004a). Harmonic functions and exit boundary of superdiffusion. *J. Funct. Anal.* **206** 33-68.
- DYNKIN, E. B. (2004b). *Superdiffusions and positive solutions of nonlinear partial differential equations*. University Lecture Series **34**. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence.
- DYNKIN, E. B. (2006a). A note on X -harmonic functions. *Illinois J. Math.* **50** 1-4.
- DYNKIN, E. B. (2006b). On extreme X -harmonic functions. *Math. Res. Lett.* **13** 59-69.
- MCCONNELL, T. R. (1990). A conformal inequality related to the conditional gauge theorem. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **318** 721-733.
- SALISBURY, T. S. and SEZER, A. D. (2012). Conditioning super-Brownian motion on its boundary statistics, and fragmentation. *to appear, Ann. Probability*.
- SALISBURY, T. S. and VERZANI, J. (1999). On the conditioned exit measures of super Brownian motion. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **115** 237-285.